

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2009. Claims 69-93 are presented for examination, of which Claims 69, 79, 89, and 92-94 are in independent form. Claims 92-94 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 69, 79, and 89 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 36, line 16, to page 37, line 1, of the specification.¹ Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to the drawings, because the "issuance unit" recited in Claim 69 allegedly is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully disagree. FIG. 5 shows a soft configuration of a controller of a multi-function peripheral and FIG. 73 shows a step 5509, in which a job script instructing data transmission is issued. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed "issuance unit" is supported in the drawings, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83, whether or not that unit is software or hardware. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Claim 79 has been amended to specify that at least one of the steps of the method is performed by a computer processor. It is believed that the rejection under § 101 has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

^{1/} Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

The Office Action states that Claims 69-71, 73, 75-81, 83, and 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813 (*Yacoub*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,337,745 (*Aiello, Jr. et al.*); that Claims 74 and 84 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yacoub* in view of *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,560 (*Tan et al.*); and that Claims 72, 82, 90, and 91 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yacoub* in view of *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, and further in view of European Patent Application Publication No. 0 529 692 (*Murakami*).

Claim 69 is directed to an information processing apparatus for controlling, via a communication medium, a peripheral that processes a job, which executes a predetermined service. The information processing apparatus includes an obtaining unit, an issuance unit, and an inhibition unit. The obtaining unit obtains, via the communication medium, function information that includes information indicating plural setting values executable by the peripheral. The issuance unit issues a job provided with plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute. If at least one of the plural setting values of the job does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job by the issuance unit. Notably, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job satisfies the predetermined condition, the inhibition unit allows issuance of the job by the issuance unit, based on a first determination of whether both of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition or a second determination of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined condition. By virtue of the operation of the inhibition unit, the information

processing apparatus can disable a finisher function in the peripheral, for example, if a determination is made that a value indicating a number of copies included in the print job exceeds a predetermined value.²

Yacoub is understood to relate to a virtual printer for print jobs printed on networked printers (*see* Abstract). *Yacoub* discusses that options for speed and quality can be presented for selection by a user, and that a server can find appropriate printers for each of these speed and quality settings, without the user making a selection (*see* col. 5, lines 22-27). *Yacoub* also discusses that, if a fast job is preferred and also a color job is preferred, only printers that are fast and that can print in color are determined as appropriate printers (*see* col. 5, lines 27-30).

Nothing in *Yacoub* is believed to teach or suggest that the server determines whether both a first attribute value and a second attribute value included in a print job satisfy a predetermined condition and that the server determines whether either of the first and second attribute values satisfies the predetermined condition. Moreover, nothing in *Yacoub* is believed to teach or suggest that the server allows issuance of the print job based on such determinations.

Aiello, Jr. et al. is understood to relate to a method for printing in which print jobs are routed automatically from source computers to printers, without the source computers selecting the printers for each print job (*see* Abstract). *Aiello, Jr. et al.* discusses that a print job can be received at a print server coupled to a graphical user interface that includes a list of received print jobs (*see* col. 2, lines 26-29). The print job can be selected from the list of received print jobs, a determination can be made to determine if the printer coupled to the print server has a set-up compatible with a set-up of the selected print job, and the selected print job

^{2/} Once again, any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims

can be sent from the print server to an output manager connected to the printer (*see* col. 2, lines 29-34). Selecting of the print job can include dragging-and-dropping the print job from the list of received print jobs onto a printer icon (*see* col. 2, lines 34-36). The dragging-and-dropping of the print job can be prevented, if the set-up of the printer is determined to be incompatible with the set-up of the selected print job (*see* col. 2, lines 36-39).

Nothing in *Aiello, Jr. et al.* is believed to teach or suggest that the print server determines whether both a first attribute value and a second attribute value included in a print job satisfy a predetermined condition and that the print server determines whether either of the first and second attribute values satisfies the predetermined condition. Moreover, nothing in *Aiello, Jr. et al.* is believed to teach or suggest that the print server allows issuance of the print job based on such determinations.

In summary, Applicants submit that a combination of *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes an inhibition unit and an issuance unit “wherein the inhibition unit allows issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job satisfies the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition or a second determination of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined condition,” as recited in Claim 69. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 69 is patentable over *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claims 79 and 89 include features similar in many relevant respects to

those of Claim 69 and are believed to be patentable over *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination, for at least the same reasons as above.

Newly added Claim 92 recites:

An information processing apparatus for controlling via a communication medium a peripheral that processes a job, which executes a predetermined service, the apparatus comprising:
a central processing unit;
a memory unit coupled to the central processing unit,
wherein the central processing unit is configured to obtain, via the communication medium, function information that includes information indicating plural setting values executable by the peripheral;
wherein the central processing unit is configured to issue a job in response to a user instruction that includes plural setting values of the job;
wherein the central processing unit is configured to, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job included in the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values executable by the peripheral included in the function information, inhibit issuance of the job,
wherein the central processing unit allows issuance of the job, if the plural setting values of the job included in the user instruction satisfy the predetermined condition related to the plural setting values executable by the peripheral included in the function information,
wherein the central processing unit is configured to determine whether an inhibition attribute is set in the plural setting values executable by the peripheral included in function information, and
wherein the central processing unit is configured to determine whether a combination of attributes set in the plural setting values of the job are inhibited by the peripheral, if the inhibition attribute is set in the plural setting values executable by the peripheral included in function information.

Nothing has been found in *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest the features recited in Claim 92. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 92 is patentable over *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination. Independent

Claims 93 and 94 include features similar in many relevant respects to those of Claim 92 and also are believed to be patentable over *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination, for the same reasons.

A review of the other art cited in the Office Action has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of *Yacoub* and *Aiello, Jr. et al.*, as a reference against the independent claims discussed above. Thus, those claims are believed to be clearly patentable over the art cited in the Office Action.

The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of Claims 69, 79, and 89 and are submitted to be patentable over the art cited in the Office Action, for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

* * * * *

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Wakeley/

John Wakeley
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,418

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3201499v2